

EXTRACT FROM THE
VIRTUAL HEARING BEFORE THE
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
PETER F. MURPHY, JR., CHAIRMAN
DECEMBER 2, 2020

IN RE:

Collective omnibus motion and nominations for inclusion
into the South County Site-Specific Plan Amendment Work
Plan for the following land parcels:

PC19-MV-005, PC19-MV-011, PC19-MV-003, PC19-MA-002,
PC19-MV-006, PC19-MA-003, PC19-LE-001, PC19-MV-002,
PC19-MA-001, PC19-MA-004, PC19-MA-005, PC19-MV-009,
PC19-LE-004, PC19-LE-006, PC19-LE-009, PC19-LE-008

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:

Peter F. Murphy, Chairman, Springfield District

John C. Ulfelder, Vice Chairman, Dranesville District

Timothy J. Sargeant, Secretary, Commission At-Large

Julie M. Strandlie, Parliamentarian, Mason District

Mary D. Cortina, Braddock District

John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District

Daniel G. Lagana, Lee District

Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District

Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District

Candice Bennett, Commissioner At-Large

Andres Jimenez, Commissioner At-Large

E X T R A C T O F P R O C E E D I N G S

*

*

*

THE CHAIRMAN: So in order to kick off tonight, I am going to recognize Commissioner Ulfelder to give us an explanation and a motion on what we're looking forward to tonight.

COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The 2019-2020 South County Specific -- Site-Specific Plan Amendment, or SSPA Process, provided an opportunity for landowners and members of the public to nominate sites for changes to the land use recommendations in the current comprehensive plan.

Tonight, we are completing our review of the proposed nominations and conducting the mark-up of the work program. Thus, the decision before us is only whether the nominations that were put forward should be studied further by the community task forces, staff, and the community at large by including them on the Department of Planning and Development's work program.

We are not recommending approval or denial

1 of any plan amendments at this stage. That will only
2 happen after the plan amendments are studied in detail
3 and developed through the planning process.

4 We have heard various issues raised by
5 participants in the process regarding the potential
6 impacts of some of the nominations. These issues --
7 these are among the issues that would be studied in great
8 detail after a nomination is added to the work program.

9 The South County SSPA Process produced 23
10 nominations, 17 of which remain and are being considered
11 tonight. With three task force groups meeting this past
12 spring and summer to review them, all of the task force
13 groups reviewed the nominations against planning policies
14 and made recommendations to the Planning Commission and
15 the Board of Supervisors.

16 This process was designed to be a
17 collaborative effort with the community, and I believe
18 that it met this goal with concurrence between staff and
19 task forces in all, but four, nominations.

20 In addition to these four, there are
21 several nominations that have raised community concerns
22 which I believe this Commission will want to discuss
23 tonight.

1 To arrange the order of this evening's
2 discussion on these items, in particular, I propose that
3 we separate the mark-up session into two groupings.

4 I will be putting forward a motion to
5 recommend that the Planning Commission address those
6 nominations where there is concurrence between staff and
7 the task forces and where few questions and concerns have
8 been raised by the public.

9 This would include nine of the nominations
10 across the districts, as well as staff's recommended
11 rescissions, or removal, of five inactive plan amendments
12 from the work program. They are summarized on page eight
13 of the staff report. I will be asking for a Commission
14 vote on this first group of nominations together as an
15 omnibus motion.

16 For the second group of nominations, I
17 propose that we consider motions on each of the
18 nominations individually after Commission discussion.
19 Our recommendation to the Board on the work program
20 would, therefore, consist of the votes on the omnibus
21 motion and the individual votes on the nominations that
22 we consider separately tonight.

23 Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the

1 Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors
2 the adoption of a Revised Comprehensive Plan Amendment
3 Work Program including five SSPA nominations submitted to
4 the 2019-2020 South County SSPA Process, including the
5 considerations described in the draft mark-up of the work
6 program contained on pages 16 through 22 in the staff
7 report.

8 They are PC19-MV-005, Huntington Metro
9 Station, including staff's recommended expansion of the
10 study area to include a remnant parcel between the site
11 and the Huntington Club Condominiums; and

12 PC19-MV-001, 2550 Huntington Avenue, also
13 known as The Parker;

14 I also move that the Planning Commission
15 recommend that PC19-MV-003, Mount Vernon Highway, be
16 added to the work program as an expanded study for
17 recommendation area number five of the suburban
18 neighborhood area between Hybla Valley/Gum Springs and
19 South County Center CBC, which would be an option for
20 redevelopment that retains the current base plan
21 recommendation for the area;

22 I also move that the Planning Commission
23 recommend PC19-MA-02 -- 002, excuse me, 6152 Leesburg

1 Pike, and PC19-MA-006, Dar Al-Hijrah Islamic Center, be
2 added to the work program together as a concurrent study
3 given their adjacency;

4 I also move that the Planning Commission
5 recommend PC19-MV-006, 10208 Old Colchester Road, and
6 PC19-MA-003, Arlington Boulevard, to not be included in
7 the work program;

8 For PC19-MV-006, we heard concerns from
9 staff and the task force representative regarding the
10 expansion of the industrial use recommendation to an area
11 planned for very low-density residential use. And from
12 the testimony, it appears that other options could be
13 explored to address the lack of septic service on the
14 site;

15 For MA-003, we heard much testimony at the
16 hearing about concerns with amending the plan for the
17 site which is an area planned for single-family
18 residential and where commercial uses are specifically
19 discouraged in the Sleepy Hollow Community Planning
20 Sector;

21 I also move the Planning Commission
22 recommend PC19-LE-001, Beacon Hill Apartments, not be
23 included in the work program, but as an alternative, that

1 pending Plan Amendment 2018-IV-MV3 be amended to note
2 that the Beacon Hill Apartments should be considered as a
3 site of particular interest for potential redevelopment
4 and the preservation of workforce housing;

5 And, finally, I move that the Planning
6 Commission recommend the rescission, or removal, of five
7 pending, but inactive, plan amendments from the current
8 work program as staff has indicated these studies are no
9 longer necessary.

10 They are PA2018-III-1BR, Sully Station
11 Shopping Center; PALPD-L2-I, Halifax Office Park; PALPD-
12 L3-I, Plaza 500; PA2018-IV-S2, Terminal Road; and, Public
13 Schools Plan Map Amendment. That particular amendment
14 had no plan amendment number assigned to it, but that is
15 the public schools plan map amendment.

16 So with that -- so I, therefore, move --
17 make that motion at this point.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir.

19 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Did everybody get
20 that?

21 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Commissioner
22 Sargeant. Second.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by --

1 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: We're ready --

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Hold on -- seconded by
3 Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner.

4 Is there a discussion of motion --
5 motions?

6 [No verbal response.]

7 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the
8 motion as articulated --

9 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Mr. Chairman. I
10 believe two of the Mason cases, PC19-MA-02 and -06, were
11 mentioned in your motion, Commissioner Ulfelder?

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Which ones, 6 and what?

13 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: 02 and 06.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay. I just
16 wanted to emphasize that both nominations should be
17 studied together. I believe that you mentioned that. I
18 had a separate motion on that.

19 We did have concerns that I wanted to
20 mention specifically. Should I go ahead and mention
21 that?

22 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: I would mention
23 them now. I mean, the motion did recommend that they be

1 considered together, and so I think that part has been
2 taken care of.

3 But if you have some concerns or some
4 ideas, I think you ought to go ahead and mention those
5 now.

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay, great.
7 Again, we recommend that the nominations should be
8 studied together.

9 Review should include, but is not limited
10 to, the following considerations: impacts on the
11 transportation network, and a thorough evaluation of
12 various site and building design elements, such as
13 stormwater management, tree preservation to the greatest
14 extent possible, and opportunities for new green space
15 and landscaping, transitions in building height to
16 surrounding residential uses, and parking management.

17 A comprehensive review of the Cameron Run
18 and Four Mill Run watersheds should be conducted as it
19 pertains to the nominations and the First Christian
20 Church, which we will be discussing.

21 Lastly, a cumulative transportation
22 analysis should be conducted with the First Christian
23 Church if the nomination is also added to the work

1 program.

2 Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: So I would move to
4 accept that as an amendment to the motion.

5 [No verbal response.]

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, without objection, so
7 awarded. Thank you very much.

8 Now, we will take a look at --

9 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Mr. Chairman.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: All right, all of those in
13 favor of the motion -- the amended motion, say, "Aye."

14 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries unanimously.

16 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Mr. Chairman --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: -- at this point I
19 would also like to provide a follow-on motion.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Thank you,
22 Commissioner Ulfelder and Chairman.

23 Given the testimony and letters from

1 residents stating stormwater concerns with the SSPA
2 nominations and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan,
3 Policy Plan on the Environment Objective to Policy m, to
4 support watershed management planning and consider any
5 watershed management plans that are adopted or endorsed
6 by the Board of Supervisors as a factor in making land
7 use decisions, I move that the Planning Commission
8 recommend to the Board of Supervisors that staff review
9 the adopted watershed plans and include appropriate
10 recommendations as part of the staff analysis for the
11 Site-Specific Plan Amendments that are placed on the work
12 plan which have significant land disturbance.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

14 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Second.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Commissioner
16 Niedzielski-Eichner.

17 Is there a discussion of the motion?

18 [No verbal response.]

19 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of that
20 motion say, "Aye."

21 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

23 [No verbal response.]

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

2 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Thank you,
3 Commissioners.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you very much.

5 Now, we'll look at the individual motions.
6 And I will invite a commissioner from each of the
7 affected districts to make a motion on each. Then we'll
8 have discussion with all of the commissioners and after
9 that, we'll have a vote.

10 The first item to be discussed is in the
11 Mount Vernon District. It is PC19-MV-002, Engleside
12 Trailer Park/Ray's Mobile Home Colony. Commissioner
13 Clarke.

14 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: Good evening. Thank
15 you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Before I move the motion, I want to offer
17 additional context to this nomination and
18 acknowledgments.

19 First, I want to thank the women and men
20 that worked tirelessly for the Mount Vernon District Task
21 Force and voting to move this nomination forward.

22 The remarkable members that make up this
23 task force are Ms. Hillary Clawson, Ms. Katherine Ward,

1 Ms. Gretchen Walzl, Mr. David Levine, Ms. Holly
2 Dougherty, Mr. Evan Kaufman, Ms. Mary Paden, Ms. Queenie
3 Cox, Ms. Ellen Young, Mr. Hamid Munir, Mr. Lynn Pascoe
4 and Ms. Tracey Wood and co-chaired by Commissioner Tim
5 Sargeant and myself.

6 All the same members are leaders of the
7 community and we thank Supervisor Storck for bringing the
8 talented group together.

9 A special thanks to our task force member,
10 Mr. David Levine, CEO of the Good Shepherd Housing, and
11 to Mr. Evan Kaufman, CEO at Southeast Fairfax Development
12 Corporation for reporting out the results of the task
13 force deliberation on our recommendations for the six
14 nominations for the Mount Vernon Districts. Both nights
15 went well into the morning and evening, and as you may
16 recall.

17 Also, we want to thank the staff, Mr.
18 Graham Owen, Mr. Aaron Klibaner, Ms. Meghan Van Dam for
19 their hard work in being instrumental and providing much
20 support.

21 Also providing the interpreter, Ms. Soria
22 Stonley, who was tremendous to help provide the
23 translation needed for the language barrier of the

1 English- and Spanish-speaking.

2 This allowed for the public testimony and
3 the residents doing the presentation of the nomination.
4 We appreciate the opportunity to allow everyone to have
5 their voice heard and to understand the process that was
6 being presented before us.

7 Ms. Leah Tenorio, we thank her for
8 organizing the residents so that we could hear each of
9 their concerns first-hand and the video that was provided
10 at the public hearing.

11 Supervisor Storck also made his staff
12 available to assist in the matters, as well, with Mr.
13 Nick Rinehart and Mr. Diego Rodriguez helping to
14 interpret written comments into English that we all
15 received.

16 This nomination was moved to be put on the
17 work plan in agreement with staff's recommendation with a
18 one-for-one replacement of the affordable housing with
19 substantial consolidation of properties.

20 I remind my colleagues that there's still
21 a lot of work to be done and to fully appreciate this
22 need to move forward with having the nomination on the
23 work plan.

1 The landlord has indicated he has no
2 immediate plans of developing this property, so the
3 tenants and residents on the property should be assured
4 that you are not being asked to relocate tomorrow or
5 within a year, as heard from some of the comments and the
6 video and some of the comments that have been made during
7 these hearings.

8 This is a long-range plan. The public
9 testimony and the videos that we witnessed at the public
10 hearing was powerful. The concerns are real and
11 understandable as it would be for anyone that may have
12 disruption to a place that we may call home, even if it's
13 an apartment or otherwise.

14 The county currently has an Affordable
15 Housing Preservation Task Force which is co-chaired by
16 Housing Commissioner Melissa McKenna and myself. The
17 Affordable Housing Preservation Task Force has set up a
18 separate subcommittee that is evaluating mobile homes and
19 manufactured housing in the county. This matter is being
20 taken very seriously for those residents.

21 We look forward to the recommendations
22 that can be blended with the staff's work plan for this
23 project. There's a real opportunity to bifurcate these

1 matters and to add great benefit to the residents, having
2 a real opportunity for a path to true home ownership that
3 will create generational wealth so that the younger
4 generation that we saw in those videos would have a
5 different opportunity in this country and in this county.

6 I will close with this. The county is
7 doing a magnificent job in providing resources for the
8 different hearings and to ensure that all voices are
9 heard and that there is meaningful community engagement
10 by having interpreters available and ensuring that the
11 county, as a whole, is providing smart sustainable growth
12 and development for the future. We get to see the One
13 Fairfax policy in play and to be a part of this process.

14 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would like
15 to move to our motion. So the South County SSPA
16 Nomination 2019-MV-002, Engleside Trailer Park/Ray's
17 Mobile Home Colony, and the motion reads: I move that the
18 Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors
19 that nomination PC19-MV-002 be added to the 2021
20 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program as recommended
21 on pages 50 and 51 of the staff report, the Mount Vernon
22 SSPA Task Force concurrent with the staff recommendation.

23 I also offer the following description for

1 the plan amendments authorization for consideration by
2 the Board of Supervisors:

3 Consideration of a revision of the plan
4 option that the residents use 20 to 30 dwelling units per
5 acre with a neighborhood retail and/or office use
6 representing 5 to 10 percent of the total gross square
7 footage recommendation of area three and the suburban
8 neighborhood area SNA between South County Center and the
9 Woodlawn CBCs.

10 The amendment should consider the
11 requested density only with substantial, if not fully,
12 consolidation of the land unit and with the replacement
13 of existing affordable residential units on site and a
14 redevelopment of a one-for-one basis.

15 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman, I
16 will second the motion and concur with Commissioner
17 Clarke.

18 What we are considering tonight is whether
19 to include a proposed plan amendment into the county work
20 plan for further study. This is not an application.

21 The decision to deny the nomination's
22 inclusion for further study in the work plan does not
23 guarantee that the parcel side of the Engleside community

1 would not be redeveloped at some point in the future.

2 Rather, the work plan provides additional
3 time to consider the consequences of an actual plan
4 amendment. It also provides time for county leaders to
5 consider the impact of redevelopment of communities such
6 as Engleside and, indeed, Engleside is a community.

7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair also seconds the
9 motion. Is there any other discussion?

10 COMMISSIONER JIMENEZ: Mr. Chairman.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jimenez.

12 COMMISSIONER JIMENEZ: Thank you very
13 much, Mr. Chairman.

14 I'd like to be listed as abstaining to the
15 omnibus motion and Commissioner Strandlie's follow-up
16 motion. I apologize for not being able to do that
17 earlier, but wanted to let the Commission know that
18 that's how I'll be moving forward.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

20 Is there further discussion of the motion
21 of the Mount Vernon? Who else? Discussion?

22 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Mr. Chairman.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: This is -- go ahead.
2 I'm sorry. I --

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Who wants to be recognized?
4 I can't hear the --

5 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: This is Commissioner
6 Lagana.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Commissioner Lagana,
8 please.

9 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: So I greatly
10 appreciate the clarifying remarks from Commissioner
11 Clarke. I do want to state -- and I have some prepared
12 remarks -- I have five general issues with the proposed
13 nomination.

14 One is -- the first being its relationship
15 with the Embark Richmond Highway Plan Amendment, whether
16 or not it conforms with the One Fairfax policy, the facts
17 and testimony as presented by the nominators, the
18 engagement with Lee, as well as the community.

19 And, of course, what we want -- and I
20 think and I hope what we're striving for is a countywide
21 solution and approach to mobile homes, not a piece-by-
22 piece or incremental approach.

23 On the first part about the Embark

1 Richmond Highway, the SSPA Process, as discussed, at
2 least to me, is designed to update or allot -- or update,
3 excuse me, out-of-date or unaligned comp. plan language
4 with the economic and social trajectory of the county.
5 Embark Richmond Highway was adopted less than two years
6 ago.

7 This nomination is located within a SNA,
8 or suburban neighborhood area, which are to retain their
9 suburban character and contain a lower intensity of
10 development.

11 It is also located in between two CBCs
12 slated for much higher intensity development as listed in
13 the Embark Richmond Highway Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
14 Yet, the nomination, in part, reflects an intensity of
15 development that seems to be more in line and envisioned
16 with a CBC and not an SNA.

17 Furthermore, the proposal is located with
18 the intensity discussed outside of the walkshed of two
19 BRT stations. How can we simultaneously encourage
20 development of CBCs, while encouraging the same intensity
21 as an SNA while also depriving the development of transit
22 access?

23 With respect to One Fairfax, I greatly

1 appreciate hearing Commissioner Clarke discuss it. I
2 will say and this is -- I am at fault here -- but at no
3 point during this -- the SSPA Process have the words "One
4 Fairfax" been spoken, not once.

5 One Fairfax is county policy. That's it.
6 The facts remain that the residents were not engaged.
7 The residents of the community were deliberately not
8 engaged and in the words of Mr. Francone during public
9 testimony, the residents, whom he referred to as "those
10 people," were not engaged because we didn't want to cause
11 controversy. I will add here that I know Commissioner
12 Sargeant and Mr. Commissioner Clarke took every -- went
13 through great lengths to engage the residents. That's
14 not what I'm addressing.

15 Every effort was made to prevent the
16 residents from knowing of the project and there have been
17 no community meetings held by the nominator. The Mount
18 Vernon SSPA Task Force do not constitute.

19 This is in stark contrast to the
20 nominations in Lee District in which every single one of
21 the nominators went to the communities to hold community
22 meetings. Imagine this happening in a single-family,
23 detached community. It wouldn't.

1 I have also heard that the owner --
2 incredibly heard that the owner has been ramping lots and
3 selling trailers during this process, not the immediate
4 process, but months back, and not informing those
5 residents of the proposed plans.

6 With respect to the inconsistent
7 testimony, the Mount Vernon Task Force noted in their
8 recommended approval that the owner, Mr. Turner, would
9 not redevelop soon, as did Mr. Clarke just now. Yet, the
10 developer, Mr. Francone, stated in testimony that he
11 could have shovels in the ground in three to four years.
12 One of these cannot be true. Which one is true? Who is
13 telling the truth here?

14 In a letter submitted to the Planning
15 Commission, representatives of the nominator implied that
16 the owner could simply redevelop the trailer park today.

17 Redevelop the park is what? The parcel is
18 zoned C-8 and the only uses permitted under C-8 are
19 allowed by right; otherwise, they must come back before
20 this body. There is no market for commercial right now.
21 If the nominator believes one exists, then I'd like to
22 hear it.

23 Mr. Turner has also noted the

1 (indiscernible) by an operating task force as stating
2 that this is -- he, again, does not wish to redevelop
3 this anytime soon.

4 So, again, who is telling the truth? Are
5 they going to redevelop this, anyway, or is Mr. Turner
6 going to, as they say, sit on the trailer park -- excuse
7 me, the mobile home community?

8 With respect to engagement, Lee District
9 -- while the nomination is located in Mount Vernon, Lee
10 District contains the overwhelming majority of mobile and
11 modular homes along Richmond Highway. We have over 800
12 units alone. And from -- Richmond Highway forms the
13 boundary between Lee and Mount Vernon.

14 What occurs in one park will affect the
15 other. They are interconnected and all of the residents
16 know each other. They do not distinguish which side of
17 the highway, Mount Vernon or Lee, they live on.

18 This is in contrast to the two Huntington
19 nominations that came before the Lee Task Force due to
20 the implication of the Lee residents. There is no reason
21 a nominator could not have done the same.

22 This project adds to the stress and
23 tension that these residents feel every day. Imagine

1 having your hours slashed by two-thirds due to the
2 pandemic, while working two to three jobs and caring for
3 a family, all the while trying to maintain a sense of
4 normalcy during the holiday season.

5 Yet, we are celebrating Christmas --
6 Christmas -- by telling people that they may be evicted
7 from their homes because that is what they have heard.
8 That has been the result of the lack of engagement.

9 They have been deprived of dignity and
10 respect in this shameful process put forth by the
11 nominator. We owe it to them to stop this dead in its
12 tracks and work towards a countywide solution for mobile
13 home communities.

14 Yesterday, I attended a mobile home
15 subcommittee of the Affordable Housing Task Force which
16 provided a draft resolution yet to be adopted by the
17 Affordable Housing Task Force for mobile home
18 communities.

19 In their proposal, they recommended the
20 creation of a countywide interagency task force and a
21 moratorium on the redevelopment of mobile home
22 communities until the interagency task force is convened.
23 This is the right approach.

1 Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

3 Further discussion of the motion?

4 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Mr.

5 Chairman.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Niedzielski-

7 Eichner.

8 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Yes,

9 thank you.

10 Mr. Chairman, I just had a few questions.

11 And I'm not sure who to address these questions to, so,
12 perhaps, it's staff and, perhaps, it's Commissioner
13 Clarke.

14 I guess the first one relates to the last
15 point, one of the key points that Commissioner Lagana
16 just made with regard to the by-right context of the re-
17 use -- or redevelopment of this property.

18 Can staff indicate what the owner of the
19 property is capable of doing absent a comprehensive plan
20 amendment in a rezoning?

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Owen, are you on the
22 line here?

23 MR. OWEN: Good evening. Graham Owen with

1 the Department of Planning and Development.

2 Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner, so as
3 Commissioner Lagana indicated, the property is zoned C-8,
4 which is highway commercial zoning. It allows for a
5 variety of commercial uses. The base plan for the site
6 reflects that.

7 And there is an adopted redevelopment
8 option in the comprehensive plan to date that allows for
9 a specific redevelopment of that portion of the SNA that
10 includes the Engleside Trailer Park/Ray's Mobile Home
11 Colony, as well as a number of other parcels that are
12 subject to this nomination.

13 And it allows for 16 to 20 dwelling units
14 to the acre density, as well as some commercial uses as a
15 part of a mixed-use development that also has a town
16 center concept and other conditions.

17 So there's a variety of things that are
18 allowed under the existing zoning, as well as the adopted
19 comprehensive plan redevelopment option.

20 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Okay,
21 thanks for that information and clarification.

22 While I have you, Mr. Owen, would you
23 elaborate, if you would, on what is meant by "one-for-

1 one" -- I forget the term -- "relationship" or what does
2 one-for-one mean?

3 And as the -- if this were to pass the
4 Commission and pass the Board and an actual study were
5 underway, how does staff anticipate characterizing a one-
6 for-one relationship to the task force as it proceeds to
7 do its work?

8 MR. OWEN: Sure.

9 I think the exact definition of one-for-
10 one is something that would need to be worked out for the
11 planning study, so that kind of remains to be determined.
12 But in terms of our recommendation, it was for a one-for-
13 one replacement of the units in any redevelopment.

14 So there are units that are existing on
15 the site. Those affordable units that are existing on
16 the site would need to be incorporated -- the units would
17 need to be replaced on a one-for-one basis to ensure that
18 you don't have a displacement.

19 So the exact way in which that would work
20 out in terms of the affordability levels of those units,
21 other characteristics, that's something that would need
22 to be determined during the plan amendment study.

23 But our goal with -- our recommendation

1 was one-for-one replacement of the affordable units.

2 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: And I
3 heard Commissioner Clarke reference one-for-one kind of
4 in the context of home ownership.

5 So many of the current owners of the --
6 many of the residents of this property own the physical
7 structure, but do not own the land underneath that
8 physical structure, as I understand it. And that's the
9 case, correct?

10 MR. OWEN: That's our understanding, as
11 well, yeah. In terms of --

12 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: And so
13 a one-for-one would mean that the members of this
14 community, they own their homes. And do we then consider
15 a one-for-one home ownership?

16 MR. OWEN: I think that would be something
17 that we'd need to take a look at with the study. It
18 would also depend on the type of product that the
19 developer would be looking to provide.

20 So I don't think we have an answer at this
21 stage, but it would be something that would be looked at
22 if it were -- if this were to advance to the work order.

23 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: So this

1 is a study for, potentially, amending the comprehensive
2 plan.

3 How does a one-to-one replacement fit into
4 a comprehensive plan context? How does the county in its
5 language -- if this were to move forward, how would the
6 county articulate this in the comprehensive plan context?

7 Is it an art that you envision of language
8 or what's the enforceability of that concept through the
9 comprehensive plan?

10 MR. OWEN: Sure.

11 So I think as part of the comprehensive
12 planning process, one of the things that we do when we're
13 evaluating it with a task force, for example, is come up
14 with, as a part of the study, a list of conditions that
15 would be attached to any -- or would be evaluated with
16 any redevelopments that's associated with the rezoning.

17 So there would be specific language that's
18 included in the comprehensive plan amendment that would
19 get to exactly those kinds of questions: What does one-
20 for-one replacement mean in this context, especially
21 since we have the unique situation with mobile home parks
22 where in some cases people own the trailer, as you
23 indicated, the unit, but don't necessarily own the pad or

1 the land underneath it.

2 So it is a -- it's a unique situation and
3 I think that it's something that we'll need to have
4 specific language to ensure that we have clarity on that
5 particular issue.

6 MS. VAN DAM: And, Commissioner, this is
7 Meghan Van Dam with the Department of Planning and
8 Development.

9 And I just -- I would add or re-enforce
10 the point that this plan amendment would be moving in
11 parallel or subsequent to the recommendations of the
12 Housing Preservation Task Force, which is looking more
13 broadly at issues of housing preservation and coming up
14 with recommendations that extend beyond the comprehensive
15 plan.

16 So in terms of how -- we may look for
17 general recommendations within the comprehensive plan,
18 but those would be complemented by the efforts by the
19 recommendations that come out of the housing preservation
20 group. That could extend beyond the comprehensive plan
21 for how it might be defined elsewhere within county
22 policy and programming.

23 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Thanks,

1 Ms. Van Dam. I appreciate that.

2 I am troubled by the parallelism. It
3 would be, to me, obviously, more desirable for the task
4 force to have completed its work and the Board to have
5 taken a policy position on this, and then that policy
6 position could be overlaid as the comprehensive plan
7 amendment is considered by the task force.

8 But, you know, that's not the case. So
9 the best, apparently, we can do is a parallel
10 consideration.

11 I'm troubled by this. The intangible
12 reality is that this community -- this is a community.
13 And it may well be that we can figure out through comp.
14 language and the ultimate rezoning that the homeowners
15 have the ability to own a home subsequent to any process
16 that the owner might take this.

17 But the reality is that -- what would
18 happen in a rezoning or redevelopment of this area is a
19 loss of a community that is just so quite obvious close
20 -- a close-knit and a caring group of people. That's the
21 discouraging part of this.

22 That said, I understand the dynamics here.
23 There is property ownership. There is a potential that

1 the property owner can do things by right. Rather than
2 have that happen, it would be better to have the task
3 force consider this nomination in a broad-based way.

4 And so I'm going to, with regrets in a
5 way, be supportive of this based on the recommendation of
6 my two colleagues, Clarke and --

7 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Sargeant.

8 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: --
9 Sargeant.

10 But let me close with this, though. I
11 would just say that the -- what Commissioner Lagana had
12 to say with regard to the participation of this community
13 in the process, I don't -- I wasn't -- I am not
14 personally aware of any of the dynamics there, whether
15 the owner did or didn't do certain things.

16 But I will say that if this task force
17 work is undertaken or this amendment is pursued by our
18 county, that I would hope and expect that our county
19 staff would -- as I know that they have historically and
20 based on my personal experience in working with them --
21 will demand and expect full participation by that
22 community in assessing the options that might be
23 available to us in a comprehensive plan context.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Mr. Chairman.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Further discussion?

5 Commissioner Ulfelder --

6 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Yes.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: -- and is that Commissioner
8 Strandlie?

9 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Commissioner
10 Cortina.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

12 COMMISSIONER CARTER: And Commissioner
13 Carter.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: And Commissioner Carter.

15 COMMISSIONER SPAIN: And Commissioner
16 Spain. And Commissioner Spain.

17 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: I'll be brief.

18 I just read a recent newspaper article
19 that said that some of the residents of this particular
20 trailer park are getting together to see if there's an
21 option for them to seek to buy out the property owner and
22 buy the property.

23 There have been other trailer parks in

1 Virginia that have faced similar problems and none of
2 them have been able to successfully do that.

3 However, there is, at least, one case
4 where Habitat for Humanity stepped in and purchased a
5 trailer park and is working with the residents to help
6 them upgrade and improve their community.

7 So there are some other options and other
8 than just what the county does, but we'll have to see how
9 that works out. I mean, the land gets worth more and
10 more and it gets more and more difficult for the existing
11 residents to step up and do that.

12 But, at least, they're thinking about it
13 and they're taking a look at it.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Commissioner Cortina.

15 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Thank you, Mr.
16 Chairman.

17 My concern with this particular nomination
18 -- and I do respect that Commissioner Clarke is moving
19 forward with the Affordable Housing Task Force to look at
20 this issue -- but we frequently find ourselves in these
21 positions where we have applications coming through
22 before the policy is set, and it causes nothing but
23 trouble. And we know that. We've experienced that.

1 And so I would caution that we not go down
2 that path, that we let the process with the task force
3 play out, that we allow the Board of Supervisors to set
4 the policy which would be in alignment with One Fairfax
5 and then we can always come back and make an out-of-turn
6 nomination to an applicant.

7 It sends the wrong message to the Embark
8 process that we went through. It's the wrong message for
9 One Fairfax. It's the wrong message for the county. So
10 I can't support this particular nomination.

11 Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: With Commissioner Spain
13 next.

14 COMMISSIONER SPAIN: Thank you, Chairman.

15 Unfortunately, I was not present during
16 the meeting on the 18th and 19th, but due to the
17 encouragement of my fellow commissioners, I did review
18 the video of the presentation of the public hearing.

19 And one thing I wanted to state is I am in
20 support of Commissioner Lagana, what he says about not
21 having involvement with the overall process.

22 I heard the testimonies of the
23 individuals. I heard Mary Paden. I understand what

1 Commissioner Clarke and Commissioner Sargeant have in
2 place with the housing committee.

3 But my concern is when I looked at the
4 presentation, I saw facts and I saw opportunities, and
5 all of those were for the developer. What came across
6 clearly in my mind are the risks that are going to be
7 upheld by the present community of the Engleside
8 homeowners.

9 So the one-to-one issue or concern that
10 you have, these people own a trailer, not property, and
11 so if they are going to have a one-to-one replacement,
12 I'm not understanding how that would amount to a house
13 because most of those trailers, \$30-, \$50,000, so are the
14 houses that are going to be built going to be comparable
15 to that amount? How will that replacement be panned out?

16 My last comment is One Fairfax. It says
17 we all do better when we all do better. It is my hope --
18 it is my sincere hope that we are not only looking at the
19 opportunities for the development, but we are looking at
20 opportunities, like Commissioner Clarke just stated, for
21 the future generation of the community that is at risk at
22 this point.

23 So with that, I would have to say I cannot

1 support a mission like this. It just seems like it's
2 such a disadvantage to not encompass how we can all
3 benefit from this growth opportunity.

4 All right, thank you.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there further
6 discussion?

7 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Yes, Commissioner
8 Carter.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm sorry.
10 Commissioner Carter, please.

11 COMMISSIONER CARTER: Okay, I'll be brief.

12 I think we're giving away too much at the
13 beginning unless -- I think the density is not
14 appropriate. The range that is proposed, it should be
15 bigger.

16 I don't agree with the one-for-one. I
17 don't know why we would accept one-for-one. That
18 basically means we're giving away the future workforce
19 housing and the future development.

20 Number three, there's other studies
21 underway and we already talked about this. And I would
22 agree with Commissioner Cortina, doing this in parallel
23 doesn't seem to be the right approach given that there

1 are other mobile home parks. And given that there's
2 already work being done, I don't know why we wouldn't
3 wait for that.

4 Number four. There's too little detail in
5 this. And much -- for this to work, much has to be
6 determined outside the purview of a comp. plan.

7 A comp. plan is about land use, that
8 there's so many other things involved in this that I
9 think we're treading on unstable ground here.

10 And, finally, I just think more work needs
11 to be done before this should be accepted, and it's the
12 wrong message to send the community at this time.

13 Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

15 Any other --

16 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Mr.
17 Chairman, Niedzielski-Eichner.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Just a
20 quick kind of rebuttal of my own.

21 I'm persuaded by Commissioner Cortina's
22 position on this, that the policy be established first
23 for affordable housing, this type of housing, and then

1 consider the comprehensive plan as an out-of-turn
2 amendment approach.

3 So I am going to vote against this motion
4 in support of continued work on the policy with the
5 expectation that at the appropriate time this would be
6 coming back to the Board through an out-of-plan approach.

7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Further discussion of the
9 motion?

10 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Mr. Chairman.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Commissioner
12 Strandlie, please.

13 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Hi.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Hi.

15 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: First of all, I
16 have a procedural question.

17 Is it possible to defer the decision on
18 this to a date in the future so that the task force on
19 affordable housing preservation might come back with
20 recommendations?

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Unless the staff knows a
22 reason we can't do that, I'm sure we can do that, if
23 that's what you would like to propose as an alternative

1 motion. Can we do it, Mr. --

2 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: I think it would
3 make more sense to defer it and include it in the excess
4 PA process, rather than an out-of-turn amendment because
5 that would give the community more input.

6 I have great concerns about the impact on
7 the community. And if staff can answer that question,
8 then I'll proceed with my comments.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Owen.

10 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Who is this?

12 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: This is
13 Commissioner Sargeant.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Commissioner
15 Sargeant, please.

16 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: We could offer an
17 amendment to the motion that would start the amendment
18 review after the conclusion of the Housing Preservation
19 Task Force. Would that be acceptable?

20 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: I don't think that
21 addresses some of the issues that have been brought up,
22 to be honest with you.

23 I think some very good points have been

1 made about what's happened here or not happened, as the
2 case may be, and I think that it's -- that just further
3 deferring it and postponing our -- you know, postponing
4 it and then maybe bringing it in later, I'm not sure that
5 works very well.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: The only motion on
8 the floor right now is Commissioner Clarke's motion to
9 recommend that it be included in the work program, as far
10 as I understand it, right now.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Right. That's how I
12 understand it.

13 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: And so my --

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Strandlie, go
15 ahead.

16 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Yes. So my
17 comments on this, normally, when we're considering
18 proposals that impact residential communities, I don't
19 think I've ever seen one that has been, for example, an
20 infill project that has affected more than maybe even ten
21 houses at a time on the upper end. But this would,
22 essentially, wipe out an entire -- it would wipe out an
23 entire community.

1 And the current Virginia code, from what I
2 understand, only provides a maximum of \$3,500 for
3 relocation of a mobile home from an area such as Fairfax;
4 and, (1), that's not enough, and (2), there's nowhere for
5 them to go. This is a community and this is a great
6 concern.

7 I'm also concerned about the nominator's
8 comments at the hearing where they were concerned they
9 didn't want to concern the community, which is why they
10 didn't raise the issue. That is a great concern.

11 We have had some starts and stops on
12 outreach during this process with COVID and other
13 concerns, but that seems to be a little deeper and of
14 concern regarding their motives on that.

15 On the other hand, the SSPA Process does
16 provide more opportunity for community input, far more
17 than an out-of-turn comp. plan amendment would do and
18 definitely a lot more than a by-right situation.

19 So at this moment, I'm not sure how I'm
20 going to vote, but this is a very difficult situation.
21 This is a community and -- 109, that is a lot.

22 I'm also concerned that the nominator is
23 considering continuing to sell, as Commissioner Lagana

1 had mentioned. I hope that's not the case and, perhaps,
2 we can get some clarification on that.

3 Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Mr.
5 Chairman, if I could, I'd like to go ahead and make a
6 motion that -- and this captures all of the points made
7 by all of our colleagues, but it's admittedly --

8 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: We have a motion on
9 the table.

10 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: I know,
11 a motion to amend.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you substituting or --

13 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: The amendment?

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Are you substituting or
15 amending?

16 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: It
17 would be -- I would call upon Mr. Sargeant as our
18 Parliamentarian, or whoever our Parliamentarian is. Is
19 that Ms. Strandlie?

20 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: That is. And I
21 ran out of the house without my chart.

22 Go ahead and tell me what you're going to
23 do, again.

1 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: So the
2 motion I would like to make is to defer consideration of
3 this within the SSPA Process until such time as the task
4 force has completed its work and the Board has considered
5 the task force's recommendations.

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: So I believe
7 you're amending the primary motion. So you would then
8 need a second, and then we would need to vote on that.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Right, an alternate motion.
10 All right, all those in favor of the
11 motion articulated by Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner
12 say, "Aye."

13 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

15 COMMISSIONERS: No.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The motion fails.
17 We'll go back to the main motion.

18 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Who was
19 the second, Mr. Chairman?

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Who was
22 the second, Mr. Chairman?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: I did not hear a second.

1 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay. Well, then
2 we can go --

3 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: So it
4 failed for lack of a second.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Now, we're back
7 to the primary motion.

8 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Mr. Chairman.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: This is
11 Commissioner Bennett. I have a question.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, yes.

13 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: This is, obviously,
14 a very complicated proposal and, obviously, we probably
15 have many of the public listening tonight. And many are
16 probably mystified by our process --

17 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Confused.

18 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: -- for the SSPA and
19 moving forward.

20 Could staff describe maybe in like plain
21 resident English of how the process is going to work if
22 it does move forward to be on the work plan and before
23 there would actually be shovels in the ground?

1 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: It's a long way
2 before that.

3 MR. OWEN: I would agree with that.

4 In terms of providing just kind of a plain
5 English version of our planning process, I'll do my best.

6 So if this nomination is added to the work
7 program, as articulated in Commissioner Clarke's motion,
8 as a part of the SSPA Process, the task force, or a group
9 of community representatives that are appointed by a
10 Mount Vernon supervisor, would be charged with
11 considering a plan amendment.

12 The plan amendment would be looking at
13 changing the land use policy for this particular
14 collection of parcels so that if, in the case of a future
15 redevelopment -- a rezoning, as we call it -- we, as the
16 county, would evaluate those land use policies in the
17 comprehensive plan against their application.

18 And so those are multiple stages. The
19 task force would need to form recommendations for that
20 comprehensive plan amendment, the Planning Commission,
21 which is this body, would also form recommendations, and
22 then the Board of Supervisors would be tasked with
23 approving or adopting that comprehensive plan amendment.

1 So there's many stages for the community
2 to be involved in that process. Multiple public hearings
3 are involved all prior to a zoning application or a
4 proposal for actual redevelopment.

5 So there's multiple stages. This is what
6 we call the screening phase where we're trying to figure
7 out which of the early proposals would get onto our work
8 program, which is just our schedule of things that staff
9 and the Planning Commission are working on currently.

10 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman, this
12 is Commissioner Sargeant. Can I ask a follow-up question
13 to that?

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure, please.

15 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: For staff again,
16 this provides an opportunity for public input at the
17 local level from those -- not only those task force
18 members on this current work program consideration, but
19 also citizens, housing advocates, the residents of
20 Engleside themselves with the opportunity to testify and
21 provide more detail as to whether or not a plan amendment
22 is a good idea.

23 And I think that's important to remember.

1 All we're looking at tonight is whether to include it in
2 a work program. We're not voting to say we favor this
3 plan amendment. We're not for a plan amendment. We're
4 saying it should be considered in a work program where it
5 has the chance to look at the consequences.

6 But if I could ask staff another quick
7 question. Roughly, roughly, for such a plan amendment,
8 how much time would you estimate would be provided?

9 MR. OWEN: I think that the biggest factor
10 in that would be probably the transportation assessment,
11 as well as the level of engagement that we have with the
12 community. I think that would be the biggest factor in
13 this one.

14 So I think, at a minimum, we'd be looking
15 at, most likely, nine months to a year before the
16 Planning Commission would be considering the
17 comprehensive plan amendment.

18 If there is a redevelopment, rezoning
19 application, that would extend the time period
20 potentially another year or two at least for the
21 entitlement.

22 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: So if the
23 community so chose the option of not supporting a plan

1 amendment for this site, this would be the opportunity to
2 do so, correct? Staff?

3 MR. OWEN: Could you restate that,
4 Commissioner Sargeant? I apologize.

5 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: If that future
6 task force and the community collectively decided not to
7 support or recommend a plan amendment, that would be the
8 opportunity in the form in which to do it, correct?

9 MR. OWEN: That would, absolutely. You
10 know, as you mentioned, adding something to the work
11 program is not indicative of whether something is going
12 to be approved in the comprehensive plan eventually, but
13 the task force may -- in considering it, may decide to
14 recommend against it and so might the Planning Commission
15 and the Board.

16 So there would be another opportunity to
17 look at it and, if a negative recommendation were to come
18 down, that's certainly a possibility.

19 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Now, what could
20 happen now should this not be included in the work
21 program and an applicant decides to move forward?

22 MR. OWEN: So it would depend on what the
23 application entails, of course, but if this is not added

1 to the work program, if the Board does not adopt it as a
2 part of the comprehensive plan, then what we would have
3 is the existing condition, which is that we have C-8
4 zoning, which allows for a variety of commercial uses,
5 and then we also have the comprehensive plan which allows
6 for a redevelopment option of 16 to 20 dwelling units to
7 the acre, which is the adopted plan.

8 And it doesn't have, you know, the
9 considerations that we were putting forward as a part of
10 our recommendation for affordable housing on a one-for-
11 one replacement basis.

12 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Okay, thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Mr.
14 Chairman.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Niedzielski-
16 Eichner.

17 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: This is
18 Niedzielski-Eichner.

19 Is it possible to defer this for a week?

20 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Why?

21 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Well, I
22 don't know what the -- for me, I would appreciate the
23 additional time to consider this.

1 Of all of the commissioners, I think I'm
2 the one that's waffling the most on this. But if I'm the
3 only one, then it doesn't matter. I'll just make my
4 decision tonight.

5 But I think the -- I would appreciate, and
6 perhaps other colleagues would appreciate, the
7 opportunity to further digest this, I think, very helpful
8 discussion; otherwise, we vote.

9 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Commissioner
12 Sargeant. I think Commissioner Clarke and I -- if a
13 deferral is an option for tonight, Commissioner Clarke
14 and I would support that.

15 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: If it's an option, I
16 support that. Ditto.

17 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: So does somebody
18 want to make a motion?

19 THE CHAIRMAN: We have an alternate motion
20 to the main motion. If you vote on it and it prevails,
21 then that's it for the main motion. If it doesn't, we'll
22 go back to the main motion.

23 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Correct.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clarke.

2 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: Mr. Chairman, I move
3 that we defer the motion for PC19-MV-002 until a set date
4 of December the 9th.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: December the 9th.

6 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Second.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: With the record remaining
8 open?

9 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: With the record
10 remaining open. Yes, sir. I'm sorry.

11 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Commissioner
12 Sargeant seconds.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Commissioner
14 Sargeant.

15 Is there a discussion of that motion to
16 defer this application for a week with the record
17 remaining open for written comment?

18 [No verbal response.]

19 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of that
20 motion say, "Aye."

21 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

23 COMMISSIONER JIMENEZ: Opposed.

1 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: Who opposed?

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jimenez opposed.

3 Anyone else? Anyone else?

4 [No verbal response.]

5 THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries with one
6 negative vote. Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman, this
8 is Commissioner Sargeant.

9 Let me thank my colleagues on the Planning
10 Commission for the sentiment expressed. We certainly,
11 certainly appreciate what you're saying.

12 We certainly do not wish to see Engleside
13 disrupted the way it could be, and we are trying to
14 determine the best way to move forward on this because we
15 listened to those testimonies from those residents. It
16 was moving. It was stirring. It is a community. We
17 don't wish to see it disrupted in such a terrible
18 fashion.

19 But we can't at this point figure out
20 without further consideration how to make that -- you
21 know, how to move forward the best way, and that's where
22 county leadership will come in.

23 Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Mr. Chairman, I
3 apologize.

4 Just very briefly. This is Commissioner
5 Lagana. I would just stress -- and I appreciate
6 Commissioner Sargeant and Commissioner Clarke's work and
7 remarks on this.

8 I would stress the need for a countywide
9 solution on this, and I would also emphasize that this
10 trailer park is not just -- excuse me, this mobile home
11 community is not disconnected from the others along
12 Richmond Highway. They're very much interwoven and
13 interconnected. What happens in one will affect the
14 other.

15 The boundary -- the political boundary
16 between Lee and Mount Vernon is an invisible line and
17 it's not seen by the residents here.

18 It's something as we go along in the
19 future, passed or not, that must be, I think, taken into
20 consideration, as well as the other mobile home
21 communities in Braddock District and Sully District.

22 Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman, we

1 would agree with that and add that that's why the work of
2 the Affordable Housing Task Force has taken on such a
3 preeminent and increasingly important role.

4 Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: I agree. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there further
7 discussion?

8 The motion carried to defer this for a
9 week. I think we're looking for some overall policy for
10 all of the mobile home communities maybe in the county,
11 because I mean, if we do it for some, it must be
12 applicable to others, I would think, by this task force
13 that's assembled. I don't know. Film at 11:00.

14 Okay, thank you very much.

15 We're on number two already. It's in the
16 Mason District. It is PCA -- PC19-MA-001, First
17 Christian Church. Commissioner Strandlie.

18 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman.

20 I will make a motion on this. The task
21 force had supported this with specific language that they
22 had wanted to see go forward through to the -- up to the
23 study.

1 So unless there are any questions about
2 this, I will go ahead and make the motion, which was a
3 little more detailed than would have otherwise been in
4 the omnibus.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: So -- okay. So
7 this is the proposal for the restricted, independent
8 living units.

9 So I move that the Planning Commission
10 recommend to the Board of Supervisors that nomination
11 PC19-MA-001 is added to the 2021 Comprehensive Plan
12 Amendment Work Program with the following set of
13 conditions:

14 PC19-MA-001 should consider adding a
15 comprehensive plan option for up to 113 multi-age, age-
16 restricted, independent living units, up to 5,000 square
17 feet of medical or general office, an expansion of an
18 existing place of worship on the subject site, Tax Map
19 Parcel 51-3((01))25 for a maximum of, approximately,
20 132,500 gross square feet of development.

21 Review of the proposed amendment should
22 include, but is not limited to, the following
23 considerations: impacts on the transportation network,

1 and a thorough evaluation of various site and building
2 design elements, such as stormwater management, tree
3 preservation to the greatest extent possible, and
4 opportunities for new green space and landscaping,
5 transitions in building height to surrounding residential
6 uses, and parking management, a comprehensive review of
7 the Cameron Run and Four Mile Run watersheds, including
8 an assessment of existing and anticipated impacts to
9 downstream properties caused by the proposed development
10 should be conducted as it pertains to the nomination and
11 proposed amendments for 6152 Leesburg Pike and/or Dar Ai-
12 -- I always -- I have this down pat and I always
13 mispronounce it when it comes to the time -- Dar Al-
14 Hijrah Islamic Center.

15 Lastly, a cumulative transportation
16 analysis should be conducted with 6152 Leesburg Pike
17 and/or Dar Al-Hijrah Islamic Center if these amendments
18 are also added to the work program, which they were added
19 earlier.

20 So that's the motion.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

22 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Second by
23 Commissioner Sargeant.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Commissioner
2 Sargeant.

3 Is there discussion of the motion?

4 [No verbal response.]

5 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the
6 motion, as articulated by Commissioner Strandlie, say,
7 "Aye."

8 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, motion carried.

10 The third item is PC -- again, in the
11 Mason District, PC19-MA-004, 4312 Ravensworth Road.
12 Commissioner Strandlie.

13 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Thank you, Mr.
14 Chairman.

15 And before I go any further, I would like
16 to thank the staff who have been working very hard on
17 this, Clara Johnson and Michael Burton, Bryan Botello,
18 Jennifer Garcia, Graham Owen and Meghan Van Dam.

19 And the task force, I don't have a list of
20 all of their names, but the Chair, Marty Machowsky, is on
21 the line to answer any questions coming up on another
22 case and, perhaps, he has a list.

23 We greatly appreciate everyone's time and

1 effort and hope that you will come back in the spring for
2 the next round.

3 So with that, we have the nomination for
4 the Annandale Public Storage unit facility and its staff
5 is on the line. We have looked at this based on -- the
6 staff had recommended not proceeding forward. The task
7 force voted 8 to 5 to add this to the work plan.

8 And one of the -- the concern that the
9 staff had was that -- for one thing, is that the new
10 comprehensive plan does not recommend storage facilities.
11 This facility has been there for decades and it's the
12 same owner that wants to increase -- improve the
13 facility.

14 And one of the other concerns was the
15 inability to have an active street front and a grid of
16 streets. And, in addition, it did not include the gas
17 station that was on the street side which created a
18 problem with a pipe stem situation.

19 So if the staff -- if Graham or Clara are
20 on the line, if you could just briefly mention how the
21 lines for this nomination have been redrawn and to state
22 your position at this time.

23 MR. BOTELLO: This is Bryan Botello with

1 the Department of Planning and Development.

2 Commissioner Strandlie, we discussed the
3 other day a possible motion that would amend the
4 nomination to include the adjacent parcel that is
5 currently developed as an automotive service station
6 along Ravensworth Road.

7 This would allow the nomination to be
8 studied to account for the recommendations and the plan
9 relating to active street frontage and a pedestrian-
10 oriented design.

11 And we also are amending the nomination in
12 line with the task force's recommendation to consider new
13 streets and corridors within the existing block planned
14 in the current Annandale CBC plan.

15 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: So the motion
16 that I'm about to make -- you know what it has in it --
17 are you satisfied that going forward this will be
18 something that should be on the work plan with these
19 changes?

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Let me ask a quick
22 question.

23 So we're adding Parcel 20 -- it's Parcel

1 20-A that's being added to -- along with Parcel 20 for
2 the area --

3 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: -- is that
5 correct?

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: That's correct.

7 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Okay, thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Unless there are
9 any other questions, I'll go ahead and make a motion.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

11 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay. I move
12 that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of
13 Supervisors that nomination PC19-MA-004 is added to the
14 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Work Program and direct
15 staff to evaluate the following items in considering
16 making an exception to the Annandale policy discouraging
17 storage facilities:

18 The subunit's planned new streets and
19 pedestrian corridors should be studied as part of this
20 plan amendment;

21 Expansion of a nomination to include the
22 gas station property grid and it's Tax Map 71-1((1))20A
23 to establish the planned streetscape and pedestrian-

1 oriented design;

2 Design for the self-storage facility
3 should allow conversion to commercial or residential uses
4 that are envisioned in the Annandale CBC.

5 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Second.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Commissioner
7 Cortina.

8 Is there discussion of the motion?

9 [No verbal response.]

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those in favor
11 of that motion say, "Aye."

12 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

14 [No verbal response.]

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried unanimously.
16 No abstentions.

17 Okay, the next is Western Annandale CBC.
18 It is PC19-MA-005. Commissioner Strandlie.

19 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman.

21 As everyone knows, this application --
22 this nomination has generated a tremendous amount of
23 interest and concern in the community. And since the

1 hearing and the task force recommendation, we have been
2 working with staff on a path going forward.

3 The staff had recommended against adding
4 it to the work plan because the nomination submitted
5 encroached into the residential community. The task
6 force voted 11 to 2 to add this to the work plan.

7 At this time -- so I've been working with
8 staff and reading all of the comments and the concerns
9 from the community about the encroachment into the
10 residential community, and I just would ask for staff to
11 provide us with an update on where the nomination started
12 and what we're going to consider this evening.

13 MR. BOTELLO: Commissioner, this is Bryan
14 Botello with the Department of Planning and Development,
15 again.

16 So as it was submitted, this nomination
17 included nine parcels, four within the CBC and five that
18 are planned and zoned for residential use that are
19 immediately outside of the Annandale CBC.

20 And it's proposed adding residential as a
21 recommended use for the four nominated parcels within the
22 land unit. It also proposed extending the CBC boundary
23 to encompass the five additional properties outside of

1 the CBC that are -- those properties are currently
2 planned and zoned for residential use.

3 And so it would extend the land unit
4 recommendations for Subunit G-1 for those properties, as
5 well.

6 And, Commissioner, did you want me to
7 summarize the motion that we had discussed?

8 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Yes. So, you
9 know, where we started and where we are ending up with
10 the motion.

11 MR. BOTELLO: Okay. And so the motion
12 proposes some alterations.

13 First, it extends the study area south so
14 that it includes all of the commercial properties north
15 of Little River Turnpike and between Hummer and Woodland
16 Roads.

17 And it would also propose that the five
18 nominated parcels outside of the CBC that are currently
19 planned, zoned, and developed as residential uses be
20 studied with an emphasis on continued low-density
21 residential uses.

22 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: The one parcel --
23 I think it's the parking lot there -- is not shaded in.

1 I thought that was on something else that I had seen,
2 right above --

3 MR. BOTELLO: [Indicating.]

4 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Right there.

5 MR. BOTELLO: Let me -- yes. I believe
6 that is currently developed as a parking lot, and that
7 parcel is included in the motion, as well, that we had
8 provided to you.

9 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay. So that
10 should be shaded in.

11 But that is part of the -- can you just
12 outline the area that is going to be part of the study.

13 MR. BOTELLO: One moment.

14 MR. BURTON: Good afternoon,
15 Commissioners. This is Michael Burton with the
16 Department of Planning and Development. I'm controlling
17 the presentation in the Herrity Building.

18 The properties to be included would
19 include the parcels along Little River Turnpike, as well
20 as the aforementioned parking lot that Bryan has
21 mentioned.

22 So the parcels here, as well as these
23 three parcels here, and the parking lot. [Indicating.]

1 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: So the big
2 concern was the inclusion of those residential properties
3 in the study area and as part of the nomination.

4 So, originally, I was looking at
5 completely taking those out, but after talking to staff,
6 they had recommended including that in the study area and
7 adding very specific language that would be very specific
8 that that area was supposed to remain residential and
9 supposed to buffer any proposals from the residential
10 community. Is that a fair summary, Michael?

11 MR. BURTON: Yes, I think that's a fair
12 summary.

13 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay. And it
14 would -- the areas that would be added, which were not in
15 the original nomination, would extend along the
16 properties -- the commercial properties on Little River
17 Turnpike.

18 MR. BURTON: That's correct.

19 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: So if there are
20 any questions of staff on where we are or where we're
21 going?

22 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Mr.
23 Chairman.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Niedzielski-
2 Eichner.

3 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Thank
4 you.

5 I just want to make sure I understand,
6 Commissioner Strandlie, what is being proposed.

7 The thing that I know I was most concerned
8 about is the transition from commercial high-rise
9 residential to, you know, fairly low-density residential.

10 It sounds as if this proposal addresses
11 that, but I'm not sure I quite understand -- I wasn't
12 able to track the cursor very well.

13 Are the properties that are shaded in -- I
14 think they're red. I'm a little color-deficient -- are
15 those properties outside consideration for this
16 nomination?

17 MR. BOTELLO: The properties in orange are
18 --

19 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Oh,
20 orange.

21 MR. BOTELLO: -- the originally nominated
22 properties.

23 The boundary in blue is the -- is land --

1 or Subunit G-1 of the Annandale CBC. We are working on
2 getting a graphic up that shows the expanded nomination
3 area.

4 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Okay.
5 That would be great.

6 So the orange parcels are no longer to be
7 included in this. Is that what I heard you say?

8 MR. BOTELLO: The orange parcels that are
9 outside of the CBC would be included to be studied as --
10 with an emphasis on low-density residential development.

11 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: So they stay in
13 the boundaries of what this would be?

14 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Right.

15 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: And the
16 large square parcel in the very center north -- you know,
17 immediately adjacent to the residential, that center
18 square parcel --

19 MR. BOTELLO: [Indicating.]

20 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: --
21 that's exactly right -- is that in the study area and is
22 that -- if it is, is it part of that consideration for
23 residential or is that part of the higher-density

1 consideration?

2 MR. BOTELLO: The larger central parcel to
3 the north and within the CBC, that is currently planned
4 for commercial and would be studied for residential use,
5 as well.

6 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: High-
7 density or lower-density residential?

8 MR. BOTELLO: It's currently recommended
9 for development up to eight stories. So Annandale has a
10 form-based plan and the nomination didn't propose any
11 changes to the height recommendations for this particular
12 property.

13 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: So the current
15 plan recommends that, but through the study that could be
16 reevaluated.

17 MR. BOTELLO: That's correct. The current
18 plan also does say that there should be a transition
19 within the CBC to the neighboring properties.

20 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Thank
21 you, Mr. Chairman.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Mr. Chairman.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: This is Mary
3 Cortina.

4 So just for clarification, the residential
5 properties that currently have single-family homes on
6 them off of Woodland Road are being considered in the
7 study, but not to be added to the CBC?

8 MR. BOTELLO: That is what the nomination
9 -- I'm sorry, the motion that Commissioner Strandlie has
10 outlined, yes, that they would be considered within the
11 nomination, but not within an expansion of the CBC and
12 only for continued use with an emphasis on low-density
13 residential development.

14 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Well, I appreciate
15 hearing that. But I also wonder why it is necessary to
16 include them in the study if that's already in the
17 comprehensive plan.

18 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: That's a question
20 for staff.

21 MR. BOTELLO: So it gives an opportunity
22 for staff, the task force, and the community to consider
23 them as a transition in the residential area to the CBC.

1 The current plan recommendation for
2 Annandale within the CBC only contains guidance on
3 transition for those properties within the blue boundary.

4 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: So currently the
5 guidance is low-density residential or there is no
6 guidance?

7 MR. BOTELLO: Currently, the guidance is
8 low-density residential, two to three dwelling units per
9 acre for those residential properties immediately
10 adjacent to the CBC.

11 There is no guidance related to transition
12 to the CBC for those residential properties. That
13 guidance only exists for those -- the parcels within the
14 CBC boundaries.

15 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Okay. And when you
16 say transition, what do you mean exactly, for the benefit
17 of the people who may be watching?

18 MR. BOTELLO: So a transition is how I
19 would interpret that.

20 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Right. But what do
21 you mean by that, do you mean a transition in terms of
22 density, do you mean a transition in terms of what the
23 area should support or are you leaving that open for

1 meetings and discussion?

2 MS. JOHNSON: Hi, this is -- Commissioner
3 Cortina, this is Clara Johnson.

4 I think what that allows for those
5 properties to be considered for is either a transition in
6 continuing low-residential density use, it could be,
7 perhaps, a few more units, it could be adding a buffer if
8 those were to be a part of redevelopment, and it might be
9 different depending on which -- whether you're on
10 Woodland Road or Hummer Road wanting to have that low-
11 density residential face to the neighborhood.

12 But it gives room to transition to what
13 the potential mixed-use development is in the darker pink
14 area on the map you're looking at.

15 And so it includes it in the discussion
16 and that's really what -- all it does.

17 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Okay.

18 And the fact that those properties have
19 already been -- some of them have been purchased by the
20 same landowner means that they're likely to have some
21 type of action take place on them, so you might as well
22 include them in the study, is that you're thinking?

23 MR. BOTELLO: That's accurate.

1 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Okay, thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Just say yes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Commissioner

4 Strandlie.

5 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Thank you very
7 much.

8 I believe -- I do now have a list of the
9 task force members, and why don't I go ahead and thank
10 everyone before I move forward.

11 I know the Chairman, Marty Machowsky, is
12 on the line and I will ask for his input on this in a
13 minute.

14 I would like to thank Robert Chamberlain,
15 Joshua Booth, Jeff Longo, Alice Wang, Barbara Burgess,
16 David Nguyen, Donna Jacobson, William Wacos, Ad Fiq, and
17 i apologize if I'm not pronouncing your name correctly --
18 Bino Gupta, Jan Keyes, Marty Machowsky, and Karen Guier-
19 Smith. So thank you very much and, hopefully, you will
20 be back for the next round when the task force reconvenes
21 in the spring.

22 Chairman Machowsky, are you on the line?

23 MR. MACHOWSKY: I am, Commissioner

1 Strandlie.

2 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Could you provide
3 some input on -- I know you voted against the nomination
4 --

5 MR. MACHOWSKY: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: -- at hand
7 because of the same concerns that the staff has.

8 Can you provide some comments on your
9 thoughts on the changes that we are proposing for this?

10 MR. MACHOWSKY: Sure.

11 Well, I think the motion addresses the two
12 principal concerns that I have with the nomination, the
13 first being the extension of commercial development into
14 a low-density residential area and, also, failure to
15 include the adjoining retail parcels on Little River
16 Turnpike in the nomination.

17 If the motion passes, of course -- and, of
18 course, if the Board of Supervisors adds the nomination
19 to the work program, you know, I'll look forward to
20 working with the nominator and task force members,
21 particularly, Ms. Jacobson and the community in phase two
22 to see if this makes sense.

23 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Right, thank you.

1 And as we heard through the discussion on
2 the mobile home park consideration, this is a very long
3 process. This is at the very beginning.

4 This is not a plan. This is not a
5 rezoning. This is an opportunity to study a variety of
6 issues and get community input on that.

7 So if there are no other questions, I have
8 a statement and then a motion.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Okay, thank you.

11 Thank you and many thanks to the community
12 for all of the comments. They were very helpful, and we
13 appreciate the community engagement as the most important
14 thing to help us do our job.

15 The Annandale CBC nomination, as you know,
16 has generated a great deal of interest and concern. As
17 described by staff, the original nomination sought to add
18 a residential option to the specific area of the CBC
19 which is currently zoned commercial.

20 It also would add existing single-family
21 residents along the CBC perimeter and now owned by the
22 developer to create an expanded CBC.

23 The nomination did not, however, include

1 other contiguous commercial areas fronting Little River
2 Turnpike or Hummer Road.

3 The Fairfax County planning staff
4 recommended against including the nomination as submitted
5 to the work plan. Staff recommended against the
6 nomination because it encroached and would significantly
7 impact the residents nearby. The failure to include
8 other commercial areas in the study was also a concern.

9 After many community meetings, the Mason
10 District Citizen Task Force voted 11 to 2 in favor of
11 recommending the nomination for further study.

12 Since the task force vote and since the
13 Planning Commission hearing, we have received well over
14 one hundred letters and emails opposing the nomination
15 urging us to take the recommendation of county staff and
16 reject the proposal.

17 As we discussed during the November 18th
18 land use process committee meeting and during the hearing
19 on the SSPA nominations, the Planning Commission could
20 modify the original nominations provided there was no
21 increase in intensity.

22 Since the hearing, I have worked with
23 staff and consulted with fellow commissioners to address

1 community concerns. And I especially want to recognize
2 the concerns of Mr. Andrew Levitz, who is one of the
3 homeowners, whose property and family would have been
4 significantly impacted by the nomination as it was
5 submitted.

6 In response to the emails, our motions
7 will do what the community asks. It rejects the
8 nomination as proposed.

9 Because it is important that the community
10 voice is heard in the future development and
11 redevelopment of commercial and residential parcels, I am
12 recommending the nomination proceed, but with significant
13 changes and specific restrictions to protect the existing
14 homes and ensure effective buffering.

15 Simply withdrawing the nomination will
16 remove the opportunity for robust input on the future of
17 this area that the community demands and deserves.

18 If the Planning Commission and the Board
19 were to reject the nomination, the landowner could
20 proceed, by right, in several ways that would not allow
21 the community to have any input, and it's important that
22 the community do have input.

23 And many other areas that have been

1 brought up would be absolutely addressed during the
2 study, including traffic impact, stormwater, open space,
3 building height, and transitioning, and exactly, you
4 know, how you envision the future of that area.

5 Before proceeding to the motions, I'll
6 just say again what the process is and where we are.
7 There has been some misinformation and we have talked
8 about it again with the previous proposals tonight, so
9 let's reconvene on the same page and move forward.

10 We have heard that this proposal does not
11 conform to the comprehensive plan and that is true. The
12 purpose of the SSPA Process is to review community
13 proposals to make modifications to the comprehensive
14 plan. This is the desired procedure and this process
15 ensures the greatest amount of community input, staff
16 review, and is preferred over requests for out-of-turn
17 comprehensive plan amendments.

18 This is not a vote on a comprehensive plan
19 change. This is not a vote on rezoning. We are at the
20 very, very beginning of a process and a study.

21 If it does go forward, the task force will
22 reconvene early next year and there will be intensive,
23 extensive community outreach and input.

1 And as also said earlier, this is another
2 opportunity for the task force to review this process,
3 another opportunity for the Planning Commission to
4 review, and another opportunity for the Board to review,
5 and this is a multiple-step process.

6 So with that, here are the motions. And I
7 just want to say that the tax map parcels that I am going
8 to be mentioning are the commercial areas to the front
9 that are shown on the map.

10 I move that the Planning Commission
11 recommend to the Board of Supervisors that nomination PC-
12 MA-005 is added to the 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendment
13 Work Program for the following modifications:

14 Tax Map Parcels 59-4((6))1, 3, 5, 6, 20,
15 20A, and 20B, as well as 71-1((02))1A, 1B, and 3 are
16 added to the subject area.

17 The properties outside of the CBC that are
18 developed and zoned as residential use should be studied
19 with an emphasis on continued low-density residential
20 uses and transition buffer to the Annandale CBC.

21 Review of the proposed amendment should
22 include, but is not limited to, the following
23 considerations: impacts on the transportation network,

1 and a thorough evaluation of site and building design
2 elements, such as stormwater management, tree
3 preservation to the greatest extent possible, and
4 opportunities for new green space and landscaping, and
5 parking management.

6 So that's the motion.

7 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Second.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by --

9 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Commissioner
10 Cortina.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: -- Commissioner Cortina.
12 Thank you.

13 Is there a discussion of the motion?

14 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Mr.
15 Chairman, Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner.

16 I just wanted to do -- I just wanted to
17 commend Commissioner Strandlie for her work on this.
18 This was a difficult nomination, and I think she has
19 found us a solution that allows us to move forward, at
20 least one that I can support, recognizing that much study
21 is still ahead.

22 But it does address, in my view, many of
23 the comments and concerns that were expressed, at least

1 on the front end here, and that now the process would
2 move forward.

3 And so, again, I just want to commend her
4 for her work on this.

5 COMMISSIONER STRANDLIE: Thank you, Mr.
6 Niedzielski-Eichner.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Further discussion of the
8 motion?

9 [No verbal response.]

10 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the
11 motion as articulated by Commissioner Strandlie say,
12 "Aye."

13 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

15 [No verbal response.]

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries. Thank you
17 very much.

18 Now, we go back to the Mount Vernon
19 District for one more application. It's MC19-MV-009
20 (sic), 2806 Popkins Lane.

21 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: Thank you, Mr.
22 Chairman.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Clarke.

1 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER CLARKE: So the commission --
5 the task force worked diligently on this nomination, as
6 well. I guess a little less controversy on this one,
7 but, you know, we'll see. So I will go straight into the
8 motion here without further adieu.

9 I move that the Planning Commission
10 recommend to the Board of Supervisors nomination of PC19-
11 MV-009 be added to the 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendment
12 Work Program as described in the draft work program mark-
13 up on page 20 of the staff report. With some additional
14 consideration for the study of the amendment, the Mount
15 Vernon SSPA Task Force concurred with the staff
16 recommendation.

17 I also offer the following description for
18 the plan amendment authorization for consideration by the
19 Board of Supervisors:

20 Consideration of the comprehensive plan
21 amendment to evaluate the plan option for residential use
22 at five to eight dwelling units per acre on Tax Map
23 Parcel 113-2((1))53 with considerations for workforce

1 housing in the development and evaluation of the
2 localized transportation network to determine the optimal
3 site access and minimize potential conflict on streets
4 surrounding the site.

5 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Commissioner
6 Sargeant. Second.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Commissioner
8 Sargeant.

9 Is there a discussion of the motion?

10 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Yes. This is
11 Commissioner Bennett.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: I have, first, a
14 question for staff.

15 Is the Verizon switching station building
16 that's currently on that property, is that building going
17 to stay there or is it going to be removed?

18 MR. OWEN: This is Graham Owen with the
19 Department of Planning and Development.

20 It's planning to stay as a part of the
21 nomination. There's no plans to redevelop that portion
22 of it.

23 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Thank you.

1 So I do have some concerns. I'm concerned
2 about the proposed density. It's very out of character
3 for that neighborhood, which is mostly single-family,
4 detached homes on fairly larger lots.

5 The homes that are to the east of the
6 property are distinctly older, smaller units, no garages.
7 I think that -- and only, I think, about 14 of them. So
8 adding 33 possible town homes in the kind of more
9 contemporary style, I think, would be very out of
10 character.

11 The traffic -- I know you mentioned in
12 your motion the congestion on Popkins Lane with the
13 activity from St. Louis Catholic Church, its school,
14 Bryant, at times backup Popkins for quite a ways and the
15 current proposed egress for this particular development
16 right out onto Popkins with only one egress, I think,
17 would -- and right across from Bryant -- be incredibly
18 problematic for the neighborhood.

19 I'm also concerned about stormwater in
20 that area. Again, it's a much older, developed
21 neighborhood. I actually drove over and drove around on
22 Monday during the storm, and I can tell you that there is
23 still a lot of issues with stormwater in high rains. You

1 don't have sidewalks. You're still using ditches. So
2 the water does rise quickly.

3 And then, lastly -- I know this has been
4 mentioned in several other cases -- but there was a
5 distinct lack of community engagement by the applicant
6 with the neighborhood. I know, obviously, the task force
7 is very much aware of the application, but I don't think
8 that most of the homeowners in that particular
9 neighborhood were even aware of this particular
10 application until it came before the Planning Commission.

11 So those are my particular concerns, and
12 at the moment I am not inclined to support it.

13 Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Further discussion.

15 [No verbal response.]

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All votes in favor
17 of the motion as articulated by Commissioner Clarke say,
18 "Aye."

19 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

20 COMMISSIONER BENNETT: Nay.

21 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Nay.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Bennett, and who was
23 the second nay --

1 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Commissioner Lagana.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: -- Lagana vote no.

3 Okay, thank you very much, and the motion
4 passes.

5 Now, we're to the Lee District, PC19-LE-
6 004, Potomac Steel. Mr. Lagana.

7 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chairman.

9 Mr. Chairman, the nominator proposes
10 revisions to the comprehensive plan -- actually, let me
11 back up here.

12 Before I begin, I do want to say a few
13 things about the SSPA Process and the way I viewed and
14 the way I interpreted the cases and balanced those
15 against the community concerns.

16 And before I do that, however, I want to
17 take the time to say thanks to the great members of the
18 Lee District Task Force. I think they deserve to be
19 recognized by name.

20 So, first, I want to thank the Chair of
21 the Lee District Task Force, Mr. Ed Joseph, for his
22 tireless work on this.

23 I'd also like to thank Marta Morrissey,

1 Carl Sell, Carol Alim, Don Tennant, Holly Dougherty, who
2 serves on two task forces, Jane Kelly, Jeff Saffelle, Jim
3 Drinkard, Jim McCracken, John Schaefer, John Tomko, Johna
4 Gagnon, Larry Dempsey, Leah -- excuse me -- Lamba-
5 Skidmore, Pamela Pineros, Morrya Jones, Andy Bernick,
6 Richard Dressner, Rob Livingstone, Rosemary Kley, Steve
7 Levenson, Tom Rickert, Tom Sachs, Sydney Potter, and
8 alternates Bruce Waggoner, Sohna Saffelle, Juliana Sharp,
9 Rand Pixa, and Liz Murphy.

10 Some of those names are probably no
11 stranger to the Commission -- strange administrators to
12 the Commission. And as you can tell, we've had a robust
13 and large participation.

14 I also want to thank two -- well, I want
15 to thank, in particular, Graham Owen and Stephen Waller.
16 They have been collectively a very patient and thoughtful
17 and proactive staff. We've had some spirited discussions
18 on these cases, but I have remained struck and awed by
19 their professionalism, their depth of knowledge, and
20 their willingness to engage. So I want to thank them
21 very much.

22 The way that I have -- you know, the SSPA
23 Process is as Julie -- excuse me, as Commissioner

1 Strandlie -- I sincerely apologize -- articulated was --
2 is reflective of how I also view this.

3 You know, there is -- aside from the cases
4 themselves, two additional steps that I've taken when
5 I've reviewed each nomination was, you know, is this --
6 is the current comprehensive plan language for this site
7 aligned with the economic trajectory of the county, if
8 you will? Does it make sense? And in taking the --
9 also, the surrounding area into consideration.

10 And the second -- the second aspect is is
11 this -- to the cases that it applies to, is this aligned
12 with One Fairfax? Those are broadly the two big tests
13 that I have for each one of our cases.

14 And I would add that -- and especially to
15 the folks listening right now -- the county -- and
16 nationally, we have undergone a tremendous and we are
17 undergoing a tremendous economic transformation. It
18 began before COVID, but it accelerated during the
19 pandemic.

20 And we're seeing that in many of our
21 cases, many that Commissioner Ulfelder motioned at the
22 beginning to move into the omnibus package, as well as
23 those considered now.

1 The market is in a way sending us a
2 signal. And our responsibility is to interpret that and
3 discuss how that will -- how and if the comprehensive
4 plan aligns with that.

5 In this case, I view that as very much a
6 market shifting away from brick-and-mortar retail and
7 existing commercial uses and into a more mixed-use,
8 almost industrialized uses.

9 The prevalence and growth of last mile
10 distribution and shipping is undeniable. And I think
11 that regardless of where these nominations that I'm going
12 to discuss go, that is a reality that we will see in our
13 communities going forward.

14 In fact, staff has -- even in a zMOD
15 ordinance where we will be considering that in January,
16 you will note that staff has added last mile shipping as
17 a use into commercial and retail locations. That is
18 pretty incredible, in part, because not only are we
19 combining industrial and commercial uses, but it's an
20 acknowledgment of the shift in the economic tectonic
21 times in our county. And so that being said, I wanted to
22 articulate that and just say that that is how I'm looking
23 at these.

1 And I do want to stress that the
2 correspondence, I have read each and every email that has
3 come to me and I greatly appreciate both the spirit and
4 the points raised in the public correspondence. I very
5 much do.

6 So with that, Mr. Chairman, if you'll
7 excuse me, my iPad went to sleep because I spoke too
8 long.

9 The Potomac Steel site is -- the nominated
10 and proposed revisions to the comprehensive plan, that
11 will allow up to 1.0 FAR for office, light industrial
12 warehouse in public facilities.

13 Should the plan be amended, the nominator
14 -- excuse me. Should the plan be amended and we put this
15 forward, you know, what the nominator is proposing is
16 combining industrial and commercial uses.

17 And this is reflective of the economic
18 realities that I just discussed, which is that this
19 fusion of uses in many ways will define future
20 competitiveness from their point of view.

21 Our charge is to see if it aligns with the
22 comprehensive plan and studying it further. I would note
23 that staff is opposed to this nomination while the Lee

1 District Land Use Committee is in favor by a vote of 12
2 to 7, with one abstention.

3 Staff specifically cited, and I concur,
4 that the traffic on Loisdale -- that there are -- that
5 the traffic concerns on Loisdale, you know, are large
6 enough that -- to draw -- to believe that this -- perhaps
7 that this project should not be put to the work plan in
8 that there were -- there is probably, perhaps,
9 insufficient explanation on behalf of the nominator.

10 My view, though, is that this is an
11 opportunity to look at the entire area and -- the entire
12 area of Loisdale Road, which is -- which, as you may or
13 may not know, when you're driving down 95, many of the
14 parcels have -- are either vacant, they are used car
15 lots, it is not developed, and it is an opportunity, I
16 think, to re-envision the area.

17 And so, Mr. Chairman, I move that the
18 Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors
19 that -- I'm sorry. Did someone say something?

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

21 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Okay, I'm sorry. I
22 must have misunderstood. I thought I heard someone
23 speaking.

1 Mr. Chairman, I move that the Planning
2 Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that
3 nomination PC19-LE-004 is added to the 2021 Comprehensive
4 Plan Amendment Work Program as recommended by the Lee
5 District SSPA Task Force.

6 I also offer the following description for
7 the plan amendment authorization for consideration by the
8 Board of Supervisors:

9 Consideration of a comprehensive -- excuse
10 me, consideration of a comprehensive plan amendment to
11 add an option for a mix of uses -- for a -- excuse me,
12 for a mix of uses, including industrial, office, and
13 institutional uses by intensity of 1.0 FAR or up to
14 283,350 square feet on Tax Map Parcel 92 -- 99-2 --
15 sorry, 1 and 3 -- I am not sure how to read that --
16 office use (approximately, 100,000 square feet) would be
17 located along the frontage of Loisdale Road; and the
18 operations of Potomac Steel and related businesses would
19 remain onsite. A law enforcement training facility is
20 identified as a potential use.

21 The property owner -- and this is key --
22 will need to work with the county on solutions for
23 stormwater management, trip neutrality, as compared to

1 the base plan, buffering, and screening, and LEED
2 certification.

3 COMMISSIONER NIEDZIELSKI-EICHNER: Second.

4 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Second.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, seconded by
6 Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Ms. --

7 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Cortina.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: -- Cortina. Okay.

9 Is there a discussion of the motion?

10 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: This is
11 Commissioner Ulfelder. I just have a question.

12 What is going to happen with the adjacent
13 or surrounding parcels?

14 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: The adjacent and
15 surrounding parcels --- excuse me. I sincerely apologize
16 to my fellow commissioners.

17 I read a draft motion and not the primary.
18 I did want to include, as Commissioner Ulfelder -- I
19 appreciate him mentioning that -- that the remaining
20 parcels be included into a more comprehensive study,
21 which I omitted.

22 Should I amend the existing motion? Is
23 that how this -- I should do this?

1 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Well, it's your
2 motion.

3 So you're saying that one of the ways
4 you're dealing with the staff's criticism of this
5 nomination is you're going to bring in the adjacent
6 parcels.

7 Part of their argument was that this was
8 going to be -- the intensity of this parcel was going to
9 be out of sync with the others, and you're saying, no,
10 let's bring them all in and take a look at them and see
11 what we can do in the future, is that right?

12 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: That's correct.
13 That's correct.

14 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: I should reread this
16 motion, and read the motion that I had just redrafted
17 after consultation with staff earlier. And I greatly
18 apologize for that. Is that allowable?

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

20 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Okay.

21 I move that the Planning Commission
22 recommend to the Board of Supervisors that nomination
23 PC19-LE-004 is added to the 2021 Comprehensive Plan

1 Amendment Work Program as modified to expand the study
2 area within Land Unit K to include remaining
3 industrially-planned properties to the north and south of
4 the nomination area, to allow for the comprehensive
5 evaluation of potential higher intensities and
6 considerations recommended by the Lee District SSPA Task
7 Force.

8 I offer the following description of the
9 plan amendment authorization:

10 Consideration of a comprehensive plan
11 amendment for a mix of uses including industrial, office
12 and institutional uses up to an intensity of 1.0 FAR on
13 Tax Map Parcels 99-2, 1 -- excuse me, 99-2((1))2, 2a, 3,
14 5, 5a and 7a and 7.

15 A law enforcement training facility
16 identified as a potential institutional use.

17 Consideration should be given to retaining
18 existing business, such as Potomac Steel, within the
19 development, trip neutrality, as compared to the base
20 plan, stormwater management, buffering, screening, and
21 LEED certification.

22 Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Second.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Commissioner
2 Cortina.

3 Is there a discussion of that motion?
4 [No verbal response.]

5 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the
6 motion say, "Aye."

7 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?
9 [No verbal response.]

10 THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries.

11 And for the record, Mr. Lagana's previous
12 motion was withdrawn.

13 COMMISSIONER JIMENEZ: Mr. Chairman.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER JIMENEZ: Now, that we're
16 apologizing, I apologize for extending this evening, but
17 the very patient staff tonight has asked that I be very
18 specific that my abstention earlier was for the First
19 Christian Church, PC19-MA-001.

20 So I just wanted to be very specific and
21 put that on the record.

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

1 Okay, the next item in the Lee District is
2 Oakwood Road. It is PC19-LE-006. Commissioner Lagana.

3 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Excuse me, I was on
4 mute.

5 I would like to move 006 and 009, I
6 believe, together. Is that -- can we -- can I do that?

7 THE CHAIRMAN: It may be difficult sorting
8 them out that way, but what's the -- are they united in
9 some way?

10 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: It's the same
11 street. It's -- let's not consider them together. We
12 can do -- we can separate -- we can keep them separate.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, ask the staff if they
14 can --

15 MR. LYNSKEY: Hi. This is Mike Lynskey
16 from Planning and Development.

17 And our recommendation -- I think the
18 recommendation that the Commissioner would like to put
19 forward would be to study these two -- put these two on
20 the work program as one study.

21 So I think it works okay in this case to
22 combine the motion, since they'll be looked at as one,
23 pretty much.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Sounds good, okay.

2 Go ahead, Mr. Lagana.

3 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Okay, thank you.

4 The Oakwood Road nomination has sparked
5 critical questions surrounding the effects of traffic,
6 stormwater management, and environmental concerns more
7 broadly.

8 I want to thank the Bush Hill community
9 for their correspondence and outreach. I have read your
10 letters and you have very much changed my opinion on the
11 matter.

12 I think, with that said, we must
13 responsibly balance those quite legitimate concerns
14 against the need to ensure that the comp. plan language
15 is aligned with the county's economic circumstances and
16 also the potential viability and uses of that site.

17 The condition of the parcel, the current
18 comp. plan language begat (sic) further examination of
19 the SSPA Work Plan.

20 I have spoken with the Supervisor Lusk on
21 the matter and we are both in concurrence that both
22 traffic and connectivity are to be examined, particularly
23 so with respect to connection with Vine Street.

1 The narrow vote in favor of nominating --
2 of moving the nomination into the work program by the
3 SSPA Task Force by a vote of 8 to 5 reflects and
4 underscores the tension, I think, involved with this
5 nomination.

6 As we discussed earlier, this is not a
7 green light for development, but, rather, it is an
8 acknowledgment that these parcels should be included in
9 the work plan, and only that.

10 Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the
11 Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors
12 that nomination PC19-LE-006 and PC19-LE-009 are added to
13 the 2021 Comprehensive Work Plan Program and evaluated
14 together as recommended by the Lee District SSPA Task
15 Force and staff with a modification regarding the
16 proposed phasing language.

17 I also offer the following description for
18 the plan amendment authorization:

19 Consideration of a comprehensive plan
20 amendment for Land Unit D in the Van Dorn Transit Station
21 area to evaluate residential mixed-use development with
22 office and self-storage as secondary uses up to 850,000
23 square feet on 5605 Oakwood Road, and residential mixed-

1 use including office, institutional and/or industrial up
2 to 1.0 FAR on 5400-5604 Oakwood Road as a modification to
3 the adopted plan option for mixed-use -- for office
4 mixed-use.

5 Limited support of commercial uses and
6 modification of the phasing limitations within Land Unit
7 D may be evaluated.

8 The implication of the proposed land unit
9 changes on the northern portion of Land Unit E, Tax Map
10 Parcel Number 0812 01 0025A and the effect of the
11 proposed land use change, a plan connection between
12 Oakwood Road and Vine Street as referred to in the
13 Fairfax County Capital Improvement Program for 2021 to
14 2025 on page 215 should also be studied.

15 Thank you.

16 MS. BENNETT: Second.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Ms. Bennett.

18 Is there a discussion of that motion?

19 [No verbal response.]

20 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor --

21 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Mr. Chairman.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: Mr. Chairman, this

1 is Commissioner Cortina.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

3 COMMISSIONER CORTINA: I do support this
4 application, but this application was really the impetus,
5 along with a couple of other applications that we've seen
6 during public testimony, to identify -- to have staff
7 identify recommendations in the adopted watershed plans
8 to enhance the stormwater, including tree preservation,
9 infiltration, and other strategies to -- that are
10 specific to the site condition.

11 These sites, although they're very
12 industrial and have a lot of cleanup that will be
13 required, also have a large stance of intact forest and
14 they adjoin some Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
15 land, as well.

16 So with that, I just wanted a reminder
17 that all of the nominations that go forward on the work
18 plan, we do want to look at the stormwater and the
19 watershed plans.

20 Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

22 Further discussion of the motion?

23 [No verbal response.]

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All those in favor
2 of the motion as articulated by Commissioner Lagana say,
3 "Aye."

4 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, nay?

6 [No verbal response.]

7 THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries
8 unanimously. Thank you very much.

9 The final item is, again, in the Lee
10 District, 6235 Brandon Avenue, PC19-LE-008.

11 COMMISSIONER LAGANA: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chairman.

13 I would -- the nominator for -- proposes
14 revisions to the comprehensive plan which will allow for
15 the construction of a contemporary self-storage facility
16 on a site vacant since 1985. The parcel proposed for
17 inclusion in the work plan is located on the periphery of
18 the Springfield CBC.

19 Before I continue, I want to go back to my
20 comments at the beginning. This particular nomination
21 sparked questions in the -- especially in reading the
22 correspondence which is what -- you know, where -- CBCs
23 that are not included or that do not have access to mass

1 transit, as the CBCs are in the Embark Richmond Highway
2 process do, are really in an area -- you know, it's not
3 clear how we begin to -- that we develop -- how we
4 capitalize growth in some of those CBCs.

5 Now, the CBC in this particular instance
6 is a heavy concentration of retail, commercial and
7 lodging. And I think if you go down 95 and you see the
8 needle building sticking up in the road, that's sort of
9 our proud -- but, unfortunately, they did a skyscraper in
10 Springfield -- you will notice that that is the CBC.

11 I'm very worried about these kinds of uses
12 going into the future and what happens in areas where you
13 don't have a ton of mass transit, no metro, no BRT, and
14 heavy concentrations of retail, commercial, and lodging,
15 in particular. They are in peril in the contemporary
16 economy.

17 And with the exception of the new Lidl
18 Grocery Store, which is nice, the CBC has been without
19 development in decades -- and lodging, excuse me, at
20 about -- in the early 2010s.

21 But something is not right here. I would
22 add that critically self-storage facilities have emerged
23 as essential components in the modern supply chain as

1 home-based businesses have grown.

2 Demand for storage and last mile delivery
3 is no longer the province of Amazon and large retailers,
4 but increasingly of our neighbors who operate small
5 businesses in their homes.

6 And in an almost ironic -- in an ironic
7 way, many small brick-and-mortar retailers have begun to
8 utilize last mile shipping, as well. And I think zMOD in
9 a way, does acknowledge that.

10 And, additionally, people living in
11 apartments and townhouses have a higher demand for
12 storage space. Especially as density increases, so does
13 demand for storage.

14 So the shifting tectonics of the economic
15 environment, at least to me, told me that this is
16 something that we needed to take a critical and studious
17 eye and consider previously unconsidered uses in CBCs,
18 because if we're talking about a mixed-use development in
19 a CBC, you know, what does that look like in an era when
20 you're really not going to get office in the same way
21 that you used to.

22 I mean, I am mildly jealous of Dranesville
23 and Hunterville and Providence with many beautiful office

1 buildings, but the fact is they have access to high-
2 quality mass transit and that is the concentration of
3 office, and especially in a knowledge economy that
4 prioritizes innovation in consolidation and co-location
5 of people, those areas will see a higher intensity and
6 concentration of demand.

7 And so how do we create success? And I
8 think that's an open question. It's something that came
9 up during the Embark -- excuse me, not Embark -- but the
10 North Gateway Comprehensive Plan Amendment a few weeks
11 ago in the Commission when we -- we were -- you know, the
12 reason North Gateway was discussed, because it was
13 without a BRT line. And we were saying, well, what do we
14 do with North Gateway? How do we also pay attention to
15 North Gateway the way that we have the other CBCs on
16 Embark? And it was a question that, when I worked at
17 SFDC along with Commissioner Clarke, it came up
18 frequently.

19 So the question is I don't know what the
20 future really looks like, but it's something that we need
21 to start looking at now.

22 This use is going to be on the -- is
23 proposed to be on the periphery of the CBC. And the

1 nominator has pledged that they will make this -- that
2 should this be -- this project go forward, that this
3 would be a -- this would look like an office building.

4 So I think, too, something that we should
5 consider here is taking a step back as maybe this is an
6 opportunity to start thinking about self-storage as a
7 viable use inside of the CBC within certain conditions,
8 particularly giving a special consideration to the
9 appearance and as well as access, the inclusion of
10 retail, ground floor community space, a restaurant space,
11 actually making this something that the community and
12 their correspondents, as you've known, have said that
13 they want. It's worth looking at and not what -- that is
14 what has driven my support for including this in the work
15 program.

16 I do understand that there are quite
17 legitimate concerns, especially, you know, you've got
18 signage from I-95, which is important, and you -- self-
19 storage is oftentimes not what the first people want near
20 -- in an area of commercial development, but it very much
21 is a piece of the economic landscape. And working on it
22 and seeing how this could align with the comprehensive
23 plan is our charge.

1 With that, Mr. Chairman -- excuse me. I
2 would note that the Lee District Task Force approved this
3 12 to 6. There were -- staff did not support this
4 because it was out of character with the Springfield CBC.
5 I acknowledge that. It's worth looking at. And I would
6 also note the extensive community correspondence largely
7 in opposition to the nomination.

8 With that said, I think that this -- that
9 the changing economic tectonics, if you will, necessitate
10 us to take a hard look at these kinds of uses and I think
11 that the -- if there is a nomination to do it, I hope
12 it's this one.

13 Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the
14 Planning Commission recommend -- I move that the Planning
15 Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that
16 nomination PC19-LE-008 is added to the 2021 Comprehensive
17 Plan Amendment Work Program as recommended by the Lee
18 District SSPA Task Force.

19 I also offer the following descriptions
20 for the plan amendment authorization that includes
21 considerations that were discussed at the Lee District
22 Task Force meeting:

23 Consideration of a comprehensive plan

1 amendment to add an option for self-storage use up to an
2 intensity of 3.0 FAR, or 175,000 square feet, with
3 ancillary ground floor retail, restaurant, or alternative
4 uses on Tax Map Parcel 80-4((1))5C2.

5 The plan amendment should consider
6 architecture, such as office appearance, site layout, and
7 other features and a design that would achieve the goals
8 of the Springfield Community Business Center, as well as
9 countywide goals.

10 Local and national examples of successful
11 urban self-storage projects should be identified with
12 their characteristics used to guide this plan amendment.

13 Thank you.

14 MS. BENNETT: Second.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Ms. Bennett.

16 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Hold on. Was that a
18 second?

19 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Mr. Chairman,
20 question.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Commissioner Sargeant.

22 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Thank you,
23 Chairman.

1 Just a question for staff. This is -- the
2 description says to add an option for self-storage up to
3 3.0 FAR. Is that in addition to the other descriptions
4 for this land unit?

5 MR. LYNSKEY: This is Mike Lynskey from
6 Planning and Development.

7 Yes, that would be an addition. There's
8 already an option. There's actually a lot of different
9 -- there's a plan.

10 The CBC has a lot of potential uses that
11 could happen there, but there's also an option for office
12 use that never got built. But that would remain an
13 option, and this would be an additional option.

14 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: So what's the
15 total FAR at this point with those -- with the additional
16 option for this parcel?

17 MR. LYNSKEY: Well, this option, as
18 proposed, would be up to 3.0 FAR.

19 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Yeah.

20 MR. LYNSKEY: The existing one, I believe,
21 is 2.0.

22 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Is that the
23 existing total or is that the existing for a particular

1 -- I mean, I see from the descriptions, but I'm just
2 trying to clarify just how much of an increase of FAR,
3 you know, with the 3.0 addition.

4 MR. LYNSKEY: Yeah. So the existing
5 office option is 125,000 square feet which, I believe, is
6 2.0 FAR. I can check the math.

7 But -- and then the CBC plan allows uses
8 that recommends 1.6 FAR for the overall land unit. It
9 does acknowledge that certain parcels could go higher
10 than that if the overall average is 1.6.

11 I don't know if that answers your
12 question. But, basically, that limit now is 2.0 and
13 they're proposing up to 3.0.

14 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Okay. So you're
15 -- just to make sure I've got the math correct, your
16 total square footage may go above 300,000?

17 MR. LYNSKEY: No. It would be 175,000
18 square feet, because this is one or the other option.
19 There's multiple options, but they can only implement
20 one. It's just one parcel.

21 COMMISSIONER SARGEANT: Okay, all right.
22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further

1 discussion of the motion?

2 [No verbal response.]

3 THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of the
4 motion as articulated by Commissioner Lagana say, "Aye."

5 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

7 COMMISSIONER ULFELDER: Abstain. This is
8 Commissioner Ulfelder. I abstain.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.
10 Commissioner Ulfelder abstains.

11 Okay, thank you very much.

12 I want to take a moment to thank the
13 staff, especially those who worked with all of our
14 district commissioners and their task forces, a great
15 group of folks here with us -- many here with us tonight.

16 A special thanks to Graham Owen and Meghan
17 Van Dam who spearheaded the effort and all of the other
18 folks who participated.

19 Let me just end by saying, as noted by
20 Commissioner Ulfelder at the beginning of the night, our
21 recommendations to the Board on the work program will
22 include those from the omnibus motion that we voted on at
23 the outset of the evening, as well as the votes on the

1 nominations that were reviewed individually through
2 private motions -- separate motions. Excuse me.

3 So thanks to everyone. It was a great
4 session and a great evening both for the planning
5 purposes and for the input we received from the community
6 in the meetings on November 18th and 19th. So thank you
7 very much.

8 And now we will move into the public
9 hearing portion of our presentation this evening.

10 *

11 *

12 *

13 (Whereupon, no further expedited portions
14 of the above entitled hearing were ordered transcribed.)

15 - - -

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I, WANDA L. ZAPATA, a Verbatim Reporter,
do hereby certify that I took the notes of the foregoing
proceeding by Stenomask and thereafter reduced to
typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing is a
true record of said hearing to the best of my knowledge
and ability; that I am neither related to nor employed by
any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto;
nor financially or otherwise interested in the action.

WANDA L. ZAPATA